

MINUTES
eWISACWIS QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
STEERING COMMITTEE
UW-MADISON, UNION SOUTH
MADISON, WI
SEPTEMBER 29, 2005

PRESENT: Jon Angeli, Grant County Department of Social Services; Mark Campbell, Department of Health & Family Services (DHFS); Bill Fiss, DHFS; Diane Gates, Lacrosse County Human Services; Amber Myska for Julie Jensen, Marathon County Department Of Social Services; Colleen Rogalski, Waushara County Department of Human Services; Tom MacDonald, Lafayette County Human Services; Stuart Maples, Manitowoc County Human Services Department; Jesse Mireles, Waukesha County Department Of Health & Human Services; Sarah Mueller, Sheboygan County Health & Human Services Department; Bill Orth, Sauk County Department of Human Services; Erik Pritzl, Dane County Department Of Human Services; Sue Reinardy, DHFS; Alan Stauffer, Waupaca County Department of Health & Human Services; John Tuohy, DHFS; Jenell Venne, Bureau Of Milwaukee Child Welfare – Site 5; Denise Webb, DHFS; and Carol Wright, Marquette County Department of Human Services

ALSO PRESENT: Jane Bungum, Evantage Consulting; Mary Ellen Havel-Lang, DHFS (co-recorder); Amy Johnson, CGI –AMS; Kate Johnson, DHFS; Connie Klick, DHFS; Steve McDowell, DHFS; Joyce Rose, DHFS; Peter Tropman, The Management Group; Dave Verban, The Management Group (co-recorder); and Beth Wydeven, DHFS

EXCUSED: Dee Jay Miles, Green County Human Services; Allen Parks, Brown County Department Of Human Services; Mark Sarvela, Bureau Of Milwaukee Child Welfare; and Gary Groth, DHFS

CHECK IN:

The attendees introduced themselves.

ACTIVITIES REVIEW:

Project Plan

The review of the Project Plan was postponed until the end of the meeting.

Site Visit Report

After discussion, the conclusion of the group is that the observations in the Site Visit Report ring true, and are representative of the experiences of other counties.

The Steering Committee reviewed the options presented in the Report regarding future action that could be taken. The discussion centered around the following areas:

Process Review

- Since the work environment is so complex, a technical option should be pursued to remember passwords; auto-authenticate other programs, like e-mail. In other words, integrate e-mail and other applications so that one password is required, thus reducing multiple password problems.
- There was interest in an on-going, key process review.
- There were questions regarding the difference between process review and usability, because process review happens now via user input into change management.
- There should be a flow chart of the eWiSACWIS application.

Best Practices Review

- Counties need data in eWiSACWIS to be more accessible and useful. eWiSACWIS must be a good management system as well as a good case management system. Keep in mind the broader goals: must be “of use”, as well as “user friendly.”
- When asked in the beginning what the counties thought about eWiSACWIS, they said ‘OK, it looks alright to me.’ But they were not sure what they were talking about then. Program people need help understanding how to communicate what is needed to technical people, and technical people need to be patient with the users.

Readability Evaluation

- Multiple Word templates cause problems at the county level.
- Readability of documents is important. Judges do not like the templates for the case plans and court orders. Parents cannot use them. Improve the documents; make them useful. We must be cognizant that this is a single format with multiple users.

Training

- Social workers have personal responsibility to report problems to the Help Desk, and to learn how to use the system.
- A good job was done of rolling out eWiSACWIS, but it’s been fly-by-the-seat-of-our-pants since then. There must be an investment in better training support. Counties do not have enough local resources to do training. There is a need for a comprehensive, state-wide training system. It was noted that The Training Council, operating under the auspices of DHFS, has established a committee to develop eWiSACWIS training.

Usability needs to be evolutionary, not revolutionary. It cannot all be done at once, has to be built over time. It is critical to look at users in their environment. Users cannot tell you exactly what they need, but their behavior in a natural work environment can tell you where they are having success and where they are struggling. When end users are part of a design/development team, eventually they adapt the mindset of the technical people.

Because of this, there should be a changing group of end users involved to ensure the perspective stays true to the users.

Jane Bungum described three types of user input:

- User/Task analysis: what do users do and need?
- User input into design: are users getting what they ask for or what they mean?
- User testing: how does it work for users?

Following the discussion, the priority approaches identified and chosen were:

- Process Review,
- Best Practices Review,
- Readability Evaluation,
- Training, and
- Communication Audit (the Communication Audit has begun)

Communication Audit

The Communication Audit proposal was reviewed. The final phase, end user workgroups, was described. The suggestion was made to add readability of documents along with the other components to the Communication Audit.

Change Management Webcast

A short discussion of the change management webcast was held. Committee members indicated they were satisfied with the information, and there is no further action to be taken at this time.

PRIORITIZE ACTION PLAN:

Usability Objectives

Jane Bungum gave an overview of the usability objectives and described the pros and cons of each. Although the task of the Steering Committee is to choose 2 to 3 objectives on which to concentrate now, does not mean that these will always be the objectives of the system. The needs of the users may change over time, and the objectives will need to be re-evaluated.

The objectives nominated were:

- Efficiency,
- Effectiveness,
- Error Handling and Recovery,
- Flexibility
- Tailorability
- Memorability, and
- Learnability

Discussion centered on these concepts and on the work of the PEP as it relates to the layout and content of the templates in the system. The discussion was not only about the content of the templates, but also about formatting, and integration with other components of the system. There were many suggestions for change and clarity that should be made to the templates and resulting documents, keeping in mind that there are other end users to keep in mind and from whom suggestions should be gathered – families and judges.

As we discuss usability, we should consider people and processes as part of usability needs; the way the county interacts with eWiSACWIS may impact how you would change the interface to meet usability objectives. Usability priorities may be variable across counties, based on different organizational approaches, processes, and skill sets.

There were some questions regarding accuracy of reports, which are driven by eWiSACWIS data that is not being entered consistently. Workers are apparently entering some key data in the wrong place. Users are not sure where the right place is. This situation may speak to the Effectiveness objective: users do not do what the system expects them to do, and it results in degrading the quality of the reports, that are an important output for state and federal users.

The Committee chose to focus on these three Usability Objectives:

- Efficiency
- Effectiveness
- Error Handling and Recovery

These objectives should guide the change management process, and be incorporated into redesigns that are driven by PEP or other policy sources. Outstanding questions: How will that happen? What structures are in place to assure that improvements will happen over time?

The eWiSACWIS Maintenance and Operation Team will prepare a briefing document on how the Usability objectives will be incorporated into the ongoing redesign and development, and change management processes. This information will be available for our next meeting.

Usability Plan/Process

The Usability Plan/Process was delayed to a future meeting, so the plan will incorporate the usability objectives of efficiency, effectiveness and error handling and recovery.

PAW/TAW – QI Project Status Report

An update of the QI Project will be given at the PAW/TAW meeting scheduled for October 19 and 20, 2005 in Stevens Point. Suggestions were given as to what should be included in the report.

Project Plan

Based on discussions and suggestions, the Project Plan will be updated.

Future Meeting Date

Sue Reindary notes that the Steering Committee work needs to be completed in a couple months, culminating in them passing on objectives to the state staff that will be implemented in an ongoing manner.

The next meeting of the Steering Committee will be held on November 15, 2005, 11:00 to 12:30 via webcast and conference call.